



**ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS**  
**GREG ABBOTT**

October 7, 2004

Ms. Marquette Maresh  
Walsh, Anderson, Brown, Schulze & Aldridge, P.C.  
P.O. Box 2156  
Austin, Texas 78768

OR2004-8512

Dear Ms. Maresh:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 210636.

The Lockhart Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for certain information contained in attorney fee bills sent to the district pertaining to a specified time period. You inform us that the district released redacted fee bills in response to the request, and that the requestor subsequently submitted a new request extending the scope of the information requested. The district sought clarification of the request from the requestor, and you have submitted a copy of the requestor's written response. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222 (providing that a governmental body may ask the requestor to clarify the request if what information is requested is unclear to the governmental body); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 663 at 5 (1999)(discussing requests for clarification). You claim that the requested attorney fee bills are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.026, 552.101, 552.103, 552.107, 552.111, and 552.114 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information. We have also considered comments submitted by the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (providing that member of public may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released).

We first note that the submitted information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. This section provides in part that

the following categories of information are public information and not excepted from required disclosure under this chapter unless they are expressly confidential under other law:

....

(16) information that is in a bill for attorney's fees and that is not privileged under the attorney-client privilege[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(16). Because the submitted information consists of the district's attorney fee bills, the district must release this information under section 552.022(a)(16) unless it is expressly confidential under other law.

The district seeks to withhold this information under sections 552.103, 552.107, and 552.111. We note, however, that these sections are discretionary exceptions to public disclosure that protect the governmental body's interests and may be waived. *See Dallas Area Rapid Transit v. Dallas Morning News*, 4 S.W.3d 469, 475-76 (Tex. App.—Dallas 1999, no pet.) (governmental body may waive section 552.103); Open Records Decision Nos. 677 at 10 (attorney work product privilege may be waived) 676 at 10-11 (2002) (attorney-client privilege under section 552.107(1) may be waived), 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally). As such, sections 552.103, 552.107, and 552.111 do not qualify as other law that makes information confidential for the purposes of section 552.022. Therefore, the district may not withhold any portion of the submitted attorney fee bills under section 552.103, section 552.107, or section 552.111. However, because the district contends that a portion of the information is confidential under the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 ("FERPA"), section 1232g of title 20 of the United States Code, we will address the applicability of FERPA to this information. Furthermore, the district contends that the fee bills contain information that is protected by the attorney-client privilege and the attorney work product privilege. The Texas Supreme Court has held that the Texas Rules of Evidence and Texas Rules of Civil Procedure are "other law" within the meaning of section 552.022 of the Government Code. *See In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328, 336 (Tex. 2001). The attorney-client privilege is found at Texas Rule of Evidence 503, and the attorney work product privilege is found at Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5. Accordingly, we will also consider your claims pursuant to Rule 503 and Rule 192.5.

The district contends that the attorney fee bills submitted as Exhibit 11 and Exhibit 12 contain information that is confidential under FERPA. FERPA provides that no federal funds will be made available under any applicable program to an educational agency or institution that releases personally identifiable information, other than directory information, contained in a student's education records to anyone but certain enumerated federal, state, and local officials and institutions, unless otherwise authorized by the student's parent. *See* 20 U.S.C. § 1232g(b)(1); *see also* 34 C.F.R. § 99.3 (defining personally identifiable

information). Section 552.026 of the Government Code incorporates FERPA into chapter 552 of the Government Code. *See* Open Records Decision No. 634 at 6-8 (1995). Section 552.026 provides as follows:

This chapter does not require the release of information contained in education records of an educational agency or institution, except in conformity with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974, Sec. 513, Pub. L. No. 93-380, 20 U.S.C. Sec. 1232g.

Gov't Code § 552.026. "Education records" under FERPA are those records that contain information directly related to a student and that are maintained by an educational agency or institution, or by a person acting for such agency or institution. *See* 20 U.S.C. § 1232g(a)(4)(A).

Section 552.114(a) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information in a student record at an educational institution funded wholly or partly by state revenue." This office generally has treated "student record" information under section 552.114(a) as the equivalent of "education record" information that is protected by FERPA. *See* Open Records Decision No. 634 at 5 (1995).

We agree that the attorney fee bills submitted as Exhibits 11 and 12 contain information directly related to a district student and are therefore education records for purposes of FERPA. Information must be withheld from required public disclosure under FERPA only to the extent reasonable and necessary to avoid personally identifying a particular student. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 332 (1982), 206 (1978). You indicate that the district previously released redacted versions of these attorney fee bills that "referenced the student's name in the title of the bill," and state that "the student's name is directory information under FERPA." *See* 20 U.S.C. § 1232g(a)(5). We emphasize that the provision for release of student "directory information" under FERPA does not authorize the release of personally identifiable information from education records in the context of a request for those education records. *Id.* Rather, in this context FERPA requires that information contained in the education records must be withheld from public disclosure to the extent reasonable and necessary to avoid personally identifying a student. Because Exhibits 11 and 12 include education records subject to FERPA, the district must withhold information from these records to the extent reasonable and necessary to avoid personally identifying the student. You also contend that release of "the substance of the attorney fee bills" in Exhibit 11 would give the requestor "access to personally identifiable student information," and you therefore argue that Exhibit 11 must be withheld in its entirety.<sup>1</sup> Upon review, however, we find that redacting the student's name from this information is sufficient to avoid personally

---

<sup>1</sup> You also inform us, however, that the district has already released information from Exhibit 11 to the requestor.

identifying the student in this instance. Accordingly, we have marked student identifying information in Exhibits 11 and 12 that is confidential under FERPA and must be withheld.

We now turn to your arguments under the attorney-client privilege and the attorney work product privilege for the remaining information in the submitted fee bills. Rule 503 of the Texas Rule of Evidence encompasses the attorney-client privilege and provides:

A client has a privilege to refuse to disclose and to prevent any other person from disclosing confidential communications made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the client:

(A) between the client or a representative of the client and the client's lawyer or a representative of the lawyer;

(B) between the lawyer and the lawyer's representative;

(C) by the client or a representative of the client, or the client's lawyer or a representative of the lawyer, to a lawyer or a representative of a lawyer representing another party in a pending action and concerning a matter of common interest therein;

(D) between representatives of the client or between the client and a representative of the client; or

(E) among lawyers and their representatives representing the same client.

TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). A communication is "confidential" if not intended to be disclosed to third persons other than those to whom disclosure is made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client or those reasonably necessary for the transmission of the communication. *Id.* 503(a)(5). Thus, in order to withhold attorney-client privileged information from disclosure under rule 503, a governmental body must: (1) show that the document is a communication transmitted between privileged parties or reveals a confidential communication; (2) identify the parties involved in the communication; and (3) show that the communication is confidential by explaining that it was not intended to be disclosed to third persons and that it was made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client. Upon a demonstration of all three factors, the information is privileged and confidential under Rule 503, provided the client has not waived the privilege or the document does not fall within the purview of the exceptions to the privilege enumerated in Rule 503(d). *Pittsburgh Corning Corp. v. Caldwell*, 861 S.W.2d 423, 427 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1993, no writ).

You assert that the submitted information includes confidential communications between representatives of the district and its attorneys. Based on your representations and our review of the submitted information, we agree that the attorney fee bills at issue contain information that is protected by the attorney-client privilege. We have marked the information the district may withhold pursuant to Rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence.

Rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure encompasses the attorney work product privilege. For the purpose of section 552.022 of the Government Code, information is confidential under Rule 192.5 only to the extent that the information implicates the core work product aspect of the work product privilege. *See* Open Records Decision No. 677 at 9-10 (2002). Rule 192.5 defines core work product as the work product of an attorney or an attorney's representative, developed in anticipation of litigation or for trial, that contains the mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories of the attorney or the attorney's representative. *See* TEX. R. CIV. P. 192.5(a), (b)(1). Accordingly, in order to withhold attorney core work product from disclosure under Rule 192.5, a governmental body must demonstrate that the material was (1) created for trial or in anticipation of litigation and (2) consists of the mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories of an attorney or an attorney's representative. *Id.*

The first prong of the work product test, which requires a governmental body to show that the information at issue was created in anticipation of litigation, has two parts. A governmental body must demonstrate that (1) a reasonable person would have concluded from the totality of the circumstances surrounding the investigation that there was a substantial chance that litigation would ensue, and (2) the party resisting discovery believed in good faith that there was a substantial chance that litigation would ensue and conducted the investigation for the purpose of preparing for such litigation. *See Nat'l Tank v. Brotherton*, 851 S.W.2d 193, 207 (Tex. 1993). A "substantial chance" of litigation does not mean a statistical probability, but rather "that litigation is more than merely an abstract possibility or unwarranted fear." *Id.* at 204. The second part of the work product test requires the governmental body to show that the materials at issue contain the mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories of an attorney's or an attorney's representative. *See* TEX. R. CIV. P. 192.5(b)(1). A document containing core work product information that meets both parts of the work product test is confidential under Rule 192.5, provided that the information does not fall within the scope of the exceptions to the privilege enumerated in Rule 192.5(c). *See Pittsburgh Corning Corp. v. Caldwell*, 861 S.W.2d 423, 427 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1993, no writ).

You contend that the submitted attorney fee bills also contain core work product that was prepared for trial by the district's attorneys. Based on your representations and our review, we agree that the submitted attorney fee bills contain core work product that is protected from disclosure by the attorney work product privilege. Accordingly, we have marked the information the district may withhold pursuant to Rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure.

In summary, we have marked student identifying information in the fee bills submitted as Exhibits 11 and 12 that is confidential under FERPA and must be withheld. We have also marked the portions of the submitted attorney fee bills that are protected by the attorney-client privilege and may be withheld under Rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. We have also marked the portions of the fee bills that are protected by the attorney work product privilege and may be withheld pursuant to Rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. The remainder of the submitted information must be released to the requestor.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within thirty calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within ten calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within ten calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within ten calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Tex. Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or

complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within ten calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Dr. Saldivar', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

David R. Saldivar  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

DRS/seg

Ref: ID# 210636

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Mr. John Manning  
1011 Lovers Lane  
Lockhart, Texas 78644  
(w/o enclosures)